



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.
1873.

I.—*The Epic Forms of Verbs in áω.*

By FREDERIC D. ALLEN,
TUTOR IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

I do not bring forward all that I shall say on this subject as new or original with myself. Indeed, very little of it is so. My object is only to give a condensed review of what has been written on the matter by others.* I desire first to call attention to the necessity of a modification of the prevailing theory of these forms, then to set forth the question of the true solution as it stands among grammarians at present, without pretending to bring the matter, which is not without its difficulties, to an absolute conclusion in all its details.

The verbs in *áω*, the grammars tell us, after being contracted in the well-known manner, undergo often in the Epic dialect a process of *protraction* or *distraction*, in that a contract *ω* becomes *ow*, *wo*, or *ωω*, and a contract *ā* becomes *āa* or *āa*. The two vowels are contracted and then pulled apart again. It is important to observe that this duplication of vowel occurs only in such forms as have the syllable containing the connecting vowel long. Thus, for *ῥάει*, *μνάοντο*, we

*Leo Meyer, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, X. 45; Vergl. Gram., I. 292. Dietrich, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, X. 434. G. Curtius, Erläuterungen, p. 96 (2d ed., 98). G. Curtius, Studien, III. 2, p. 399. Brugman, Curtius' Studien, IV. 1, p. 184.

have *ὀπάα*, *μνῶοντο*; but for *ὀπάετε* we do not have any such form as *ὀπάατε*, but only the vulgar contracted *ὀπᾶτε*. A single exception will be noted below.

Now such a separation of one vowel into two is very unlikely to happen, being contrary to the laws of phonetic decay, and contrary to experience as well, for nothing of the sort can, I think, be shown to have taken place anywhere else. But to say nothing of this, the theory goes a long way around to explain a very simple phenomenon. Compare *ὀπάεσθαι* with *ὀπάασθαι*. They differ only in the color of one vowel. Even the accent of the two forms is the same. Why, then, tell us that between these lies the very different *ὀπᾶσθαι*? Why two long steps when one short one will do as well?

Evidently *ὀπάασθαι* may be much more simply and naturally accounted for by supposing it to have arisen directly from *ὀπάεσθαι*. Instead of being a protracted form of *ὀπᾶσθαι*, it is identical with the uncontracted *ὀπάεσθαι*, but with the vowels assimilated preparatory to contraction. The order of development is not *ὀπάεσθαι*, *ὀπᾶσθαι*, *ὀπάασθαι*; but *ὀπάεσθαι*, *ὀπάασθαι*, *ὀπᾶσθαι*. The Epic form is an intermediate one between the original and the vulgar Attic. This is so clear as to convince at first glance. I do not think that any scholar who has given the least attention to modern historical grammar holds to the old view. It arose from the perverse habit of taking the language of Attic prose as the standard, and looking upon all other forms as variations and corruptions of this.

It is, then, almost self-evident that the forms called protracted or distracted are really uncontracted forms with one vowel assimilated to the other, and in this sense Kühner, in his new larger grammar, has treated of them, though without committing himself further as to the explanation of details. But the matter is complicated by the changes in quantity which accompany this assimilation. For if not always, at least almost always, one or both of the contiguous vowels are lengthened. The difficult questions which arise are: How is this lengthening to be accounted for? and in connection with this: How far is the traditional orthography of these forms to be relied on as genuine? And here opinions differ widely.

We shall consider first the lengthening of the first or characteristic vowel, then the lengthening of the second or connecting vowel; lastly, the lengthening of both together.

The cases in which the former or characteristic vowel alone is lengthened are not very numerous, and seem to occur only where the form could not otherwise be brought into the verse; that is, where the syllable preceding the characteristic vowel is long either by nature or position.* Examples are *ἡβώντες*, *μνώοντο*, *μνώμενος*, *ἡβώοιμι*, *δρώοιμι*; *μνάασθαι*, *ἡγάασθαι*. Neither Leo Meyer nor Dietrich can account for this lengthening in any better way than by saying that it took place from metrical necessity. This, though more excusable at the time they wrote, is unsatisfactory. Metrical convenience was indeed subserved, and had its influence doubtless in determining the form of the words, but it was not the motive power. Curtius explains the lengthening much better as compensative. For it is well known that the contracted verbs have lost a consonant *j* between the stem and the connecting vowel. Most of them are formed from nominal stems by adding the syllable *ja*, to which are then appended the endings. Accordingly *ἡβα-jesθε*, *ἡβα-jοντες*, are to be presumed. From these would come *ἡβά-εσθε*, *ἡβά-οντες*, and thence by assimilation *ἡγά-ασθε*, *ἡβώ-οντες*. It would not be needful to adduce further proof of this view but for a remark which Brugman (Curt. Stud., IV. 1. 182) makes. He seems to think that the length may, in some cases at least, be attributable to the nominal stems whence the verbs come. And it is true that a very large proportion of the verbs in *-áw* are derived from feminine stems in *ā*; *αἰτιάομαι* from *αἰρία*, etc. Brugman thinks it possible that these have often preserved the long *ā* of the stem in the verbal forms. Nor is it a fatal objection to this theory to say that many of the verbs which show this lengthening are not thus derived from stems in long *ā*. For in a partly artificial dialect, like the Epic, it is not at all inconceivable that a type once established should transfer itself to forms where it was not organically justified.

* A single exception is *γελώντες*, for which, however, many read *γελοιῶντες*.

But there are other and more cogent reasons for preferring the view of Curtius, after all. First, other languages, and particularly the Sanscrit, do not have denominative verbs of the form $\tilde{a}\text{-}j\tilde{a}mi$, or, if the Sanscrit does have a few such, it is merely a phonetic variation, and does not seem to have anything to do with feminines in \tilde{a} . On the contrary, the denominatives, whether formed from feminine stems in \tilde{a} or masculines in \tilde{a} , have alike the form $\tilde{a}\text{-}j\tilde{a}mi$ with short a . Accordingly, from $\eta\beta\tilde{a}$ ($\eta\beta\eta$) would be formed $\eta\beta\tilde{a}\text{-}j\tilde{a}mi$ with short a . In fact, the distinction between o and a stems, or rather between short and long a stems, is not very firm. Just as the former take the place of the latter in composition ($\tau\mu o\text{-}\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}a$) and in derivative nouns ($\sigma\kappa\iota\acute{o}\text{-}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), so also in denominative verbs ($\zeta\eta\mu\acute{o}\omega$ from $\zeta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}a$). Hence, after all, we shall best refer all the verbs in $\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\omega$ to the common fundamental type $\tilde{a}\text{-}j\tilde{a}mi$. Yet another consideration is, that the lengthened characteristic vowel is not confined to the verbs in $\acute{\alpha}\omega$, but is found in those in $\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\acute{\omicron}\omega$ as well; as in Lesbian forms like $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\omega$, $\pi o\theta\acute{\eta}\omega$ for $\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\pi o\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, and on Delphic inscriptions $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\sigma\alpha$, etc., to say nothing of traces of the same in the Epic language. Here, of course, no other supposition is possible than that the spirant has lengthened the preceding vowel. Indeed, Georg Curtius in a recent essay (*Stud.* III. p. 401), after a survey of all dialectic testimony, is led to the conclusion that the disappearance of the spirant j left the characteristic vowel in all these verbs long, and that $\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\omega$ have everywhere arisen from an older $\acute{a}\omega$, $\acute{é}\omega$, $\acute{ó}\omega$. This influence of the spirant is therefore in any case a fixed fact, and we shall be safest in applying it to the verbs in $\acute{\alpha}\omega$ as well as to the others.

We conclude, then, that the lengthening of the first or characteristic vowel is due to the ejection of the semivowel j .

The second case we had to consider was the lengthening of the second or connecting vowel. Examples are $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{o}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{o}\omega\tau\epsilon$ ($\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\iota\tau\epsilon$), $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\omega\phi o$ ($\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\omega\iota o$), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\acute{\omega}\omega\sigma\alpha$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{o}\omega\sigma\iota$; $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\alpha\nu$, and perhaps $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ and similar forms, though in these last there is nothing to lead us to think the second a long by nature, except the analogy of other forms.

The means for accounting for these forms lie already provided, though ignored by Meyer and very imperfectly recognized by Dietrich. The same shifting of quantity in hiatus, which turns *λάος* to *λεώς*, *Ἀτρείδᾱο* to *Ἀτρείδεω*, *βασιλῆος* to *βασιλέως*, *πόληος* to *πόλεως*, *Κῶος* to *Κόως*, etc., will transform *ὀρώοντες*, *ὀράαι* into *ὀρόωντες*, *ὀράα*. We have only to suppose that the first vowel, lengthened by the influence of the disappearing spirant, afterward transferred its length to the following syllable. Or, if any one prefers to think with Delbrück that in these cases no transfer of quantity takes place, but that the spirant operates directly, now on the preceding, now on the following vowel,* he can apply that theory to these verbal forms as well. And this explains, too, why the forms with *αᾶ*, *ωω*, are so much more common than those with *ᾱα*, *ωο*. The forms with shifted quantity are the favorite ones, just as *Κόως*, *Ἀθόως*, *γαλόως* are always used in Homer, never *Κῶος*, etc.; and so always *ὀρόωντες*, never *ὀρώοντες*. Only when the change would give the word such a form as to exclude it from the verse does the poet retain *ωο*, *ᾱα*.

While, then, we have ample means for explaining this prolongation of the second vowel, there is yet a suspicious circumstance about the matter. It is this: this lengthening never falls upon a syllable which is not already long by nature or position. It never really alters the quantity of a syllable nor the scanning of a word. Leo Meyer considers this proof that the lengthening is only a fictitious one, that the forms are simply misspelled from a false theory, and in remembrance of the vulgar contracted forms. He boldly claims that we should write *ὀρόονται* for *ὀρόωνται*, *βοόοντες* for *βοόωντες*, *ὀρόοιεν* for *ὀρόφεν*, and to be consistent he should, though he does not, require *ὀράει* or *ὀράαι* for *ὀράα*.† Now this proposition, startling as it is, has much in its favor. For, one may ask, if there was such a thing as a genuine lengthening of the connecting vowel, why do we not have such forms as *ὀρόωμεν* for *ὀράομεν*, *αἰτιάᾱται* for *αἰτιάεται*, etc., which would be extremely convenient for the

* A view which I cannot accede to, and which certainly does not explain all forms; Curt. Stud., III. 399, Brugman, (l. c.) p. 140.

† Somewhat inconsistently he seems, if I understand him, to admit *ω* before (*υ*)*σ*; *δρόωσα*, *δρόωσι*, etc. But if one such form is false, why not all the rest?

poet and fit his verse admirably? Why must the poet avail himself of this liberty of prolongation only when it can do him no good? Why, above all, before two consonants, in which situation, as is well known, an organically long vowel loves to shorten itself?

Curtius replies to Meyer in the "Erläuterungen zu meiner Schulgrammatik," p. 96 (98, 2d ed.), and argues in opposition to the proposed change that *ὀρόονται, βοόοντες, ὀρόοιεν*, would not when contracted give the actually existing forms, *ὀρῶνται, βοῶντες, ὀρῶεν*, but rather *ὀροῦνται, βοοῦντες, ὀροῖεν*. Leo Meyer, anticipating this objection, says truly enough that a much older and more general law of contraction is, that two like vowels unite to form the corresponding long. To this Curtius rejoins that the contraction in question does not belong to a very old period of the language, but a comparatively recent one; that there is no reason for applying to these verbal forms any other rule than to *νόος, νοῦς*. But just here Curtius does not seem to me to reason with his usual clearness. For we ought not to lose sight of the fact that we have to start, not from the theoretical *oo*, but from an actual *ao*. Now, it is matter of solid fact that *ao* does in hundreds of cases in all dialects contract to *ω*, and that too where no previous prolongation of either vowel can be thought of. Thus *κέρως* from *κέρας* (*κερασ-ος*), *ῥῶπλα* from *τὰ ῥπλα*. And if we follow the current view of the process of contraction we shall suppose that an assimilation prepared the way for contraction: *κέρως*, *ῥῶπλα*. In this case even Curtius will be forced to admit that *oo*, when it has arisen from *ao*, can contract to *ω*. Or, if he still maintains the impossibility of this, he has still proved nothing but that *ao* does not pass into *ω* through the intermediate stage *oo*. But neither is the intermediate stage necessarily *ow*, for, in the examples just cited, prolonged forms like *κερως, ῥωπλα*, are, as we have seen, not supposable. *Ao* must then become *ω* by some other quite different process, and Leo Meyer needs only to shift his ground a trifle, derive *ὀρῶνται* from *ὀράονται* by this process, whatever it be, and still uphold *ὀρόονται* in place of *ὀρόωνται*, not considering it as an intermediate form, but rather as a variation of *ὀράονται*. Indeed, if, setting aside this

older treatise, we recur to Curtius' own latest views, as set forth in the article referred to a while ago, we find that they furnish a perfectly satisfactory explanation of Meyer's forms. For Curtius now holds, as we saw, that the spirant everywhere lengthened the preceding vowel, so that from *ὀραῖονται* we get *ὀρᾶνται*, *ὀρώονται*. Now from *ὀρώονται* we might on the one hand derive the contracted *ὀρῶνται*, and on the other hand, to be sure, the traditional *ὀρόωνται*, but also equally well by a simple shortening, *ὀρόονται*, just like Ionic *βασιλέος* from *βασιλῆος*. Accordingly *ὀρῶνται* would come, after all, not from *ὀρόονται*, but from *ὀρώονται*, and so the whole objection of Curtius fall to the ground.

While then we cannot find that Curtius has overthrown Meyer's hypothesis by an appeal to the laws of contraction, we nevertheless think there are sufficient reasons for rejecting it. First, that the spirant could and actually did lengthen the connecting vowel in verbal forms, is placed beyond a doubt by Doric forms like *ἐμετρίωμες* (*ἐμετρέομεν*), *μετρίωμενος* (*μετρεόμενος*), *Φηλιώμενοι* (*εἰλεόμενοι*); Ahrens, II. p. 208. These are exactly analogous to the *ὀρόωμεν*, etc., which we missed in the Homeric language, as well as to the existing *ὀρόωνται*, etc. To be sure, the existence of these forms in one dialect is not directly conclusive for another; the prolongation might have taken place in Doric and not in Ionic. Yet, as corroborative evidence, they have great weight. But, after all, the consideration which falls most heavily into the scale against Meyer is the overwhelming presumption in favor of tradition, the unlikelihood of a systematic and arbitrary misspelling of forms so frequently recurring. For the forms in question do not occur once, twice, or thrice, but by scores and hundreds. It is true that the earliest copies were written in an alphabet that made no distinction between the long and short *ο*-sound. But the ancients, in transcribing these words into the later alphabet, must have been guided by something more than mere conjecture. For the Alexandrines had manuscripts from all parts of the Grecian world, yet neither from them nor from any other source do we learn of any variation in the spelling of these forms. The ancients, then, read these forms with *ω*,

and why? From nothing but a well-marked tradition from the lips of rhapsodists and the schools of Epic song. For we must not lose sight of the fact that long after the time of the Peloponnesian war the Homeric poems were not written documents for the eye, but living, spoken words, and that their forms, and doubtless the proper manner of recitation and pronunciation, were matters of fixed oral tradition, and that the delicate ear of the Hellenes would not have tolerated any wholesale alteration in quantities. At any rate, the blunder—if blunder there be—must have lain away back with the rhapsodists themselves. It is plain that under these circumstances nothing but the most cogent necessity should induce us to question the tradition with regard to forms so plentifully attested as these. There is in this case no such need, but rather, as we have seen, Doric analogies, and ample resources for explaining the phenomenon.

As to the question asked above: how it happens that the lengthening of connecting vowel never affects a short syllable, I can answer this only by asking another; how it is that the characteristic vowel never is lengthened before a short syllable. One such case does indeed occur, *μνωόμενος*; but this is exceptional. If we miss *ὀρώμεν*, *ὀράατε*, we also miss equally *ἡβώμεν*, *ἡβάατε*. Yet the lengthening of the characteristic vowel is not to be questioned or explained away. Evidently there were some very subtle influences at work which led to the retention of the uncontracted and prolonged forms *only when the syllable containing the connecting vowel was long*, and their rejection in the other case. What these influences were it would hardly be possible to conjecture.

Thirdly, cases occur in which both vowels, the characteristic and the connecting vowel, are lengthened. Examples are: *ἡβώωσα* (*ἡβάουσα*), *δρώωσι* (*δράουσι*); *μενοινάα* (*μενοινάει*). These are in truth perplexing forms. Can we suppose that the spirant lengthened both vowels? Brugman (l. c., p. 175) has collected half a dozen words where he thinks digamma to have done this. Some of these are far from absolutely certain, and the phenomenon is at any rate a rarity. Even if proved for *ϕ*, it would not follow that the weaker spirant *j*

could have the same effect. Here, if anywhere, we are inclined to think that the supposition of false spelling would be in place. This supposition would be here far less rash. For these forms are not numerous, and the type last treated of, so greatly preponderating, would furnish an apparent standard to which the others, their true nature lost sight of, might be made to conform; so for *δρώωσι*, *όρώωσι* would be a model, for *μενoinάα*, *όράα*. Possibly, therefore, *δρώουσι*, *ήβώουσα*, *μενoinάα* were the genuine forms. Already there is an inconsistency in the traditional spelling, for the optative *δρώοιμι* ought, if treated like *μενoinάα*, to become *δρώοιμι*; compare *όρόοιμι*.* Curtius (Stud., III. 400) and Brugman favor this view. The former, indeed, suggests another possibility, namely, a further assimilating influence of the vowels on one another, by which *δρώουσι* became *δρώωσι*. We can easily understand this in *δρώουσι*, for the *ου* in this word was not originally a diphthong, only a modified *ο*-sound and already long. How it could apply to *μενoinάα* we hardly see. Finally, I will not undertake to say that it is impossible that the spirant may lengthen both vowels, and so justify the forms perfectly.

The principles adjusted, so far as they can be, several details require mention.

1. Does assimilation without lengthening of either vowel occur? The 1st pers. *όρώω*, partic. *όρώων*, hardly prove this, since the intention may have been to shift the length to the connecting vowel, though as this was already long it could not be in effect altered. The same is true of the subjunctive *έάας*, Od. xii. 137. The forms *όράασθαι* and similar ones are, as remarked above, indecisive; but perhaps from the analogy of *όρόωντες* we ought to consider the second *α* long by nature.

2. Such forms as *όρώωσι*, *όρώωσα*, are not to be explained from *όράουσι*, *όράουσα*, but directly from the older *όράωνσι*, *όράωνσα*; thence, with assimilation and lengthening of second vowel, *όρόωνσι*, *όρόωνσα*; lastly, the *ν* was dropped.

3. The infin. *όράειν* makes *όράᾱν* without *ι* subscript. For the *ει* is a very different one from that in *όράει*; it was not originally a diphthongal sound at all (probably from *εε* by

* *μενoinώω* is already in order, as the second *ω* is long of itself.

contraction), and the ending *ειν* sometimes shortens itself to *εν*. We are taught that the contract infinitives *ὀρᾶν*, *φιλεῖν*, *δηλοῦν*, contain this short ending *εν*. This is not wrong, yet we must not think of this *εν* as the older infinitive ending, but as, after all, a shortened form of *ειν* or *εεν*.* And we may not derive *ὀράαν* from *ὀράεν*, because this would violate the rule that lengthening of the latter vowel occurs only in a long syllable.

4. The simple uncontracted form, without either lengthening or assimilation, occurs, though sparingly: *κατεσκίαον* (not otherwise to be got into metre), *πέραον* (imperfect), *ᾠοιδίαι*, *τηλεθάοντες*, *ναιετάουσι*, *γοάοιεν*, and others, though we can discern no reason why these last should not be *ᾠοιδία*, *τηλεθώντες*, *ναιετώσι*, etc. Both *μειδιάων* and *μειδιών* occur, the one in the Hymns, the other in the Iliad. For *γοάοιεν* (Od. xxiv. 190) and *γοάοιμεν* (Il. xxiv. 664) Bekker writes *γοόφεν*, *γοόφμεν*, following a hint in an Egyptian papyrus.

5. Lengthening of the one or the other vowel may occur without assimilation: thus the former vowel is prolonged in *πεινᾶων*, *διψᾶοντα*, *ἀναμαιμάει*: why these should not be written *πεινώων* (like *μαιμών*), *διψώντα* (like *ἡβώντα*), *ἀναμαιμά* (like *μενοινά*) no one can say. The latter vowel is lengthened in the singular form *ναιετάωσα*, though this verb elsewhere has nothing but uncontracted, unlengthened forms. Bekker reads on his own authority *ναιετάουσα*. If the traditional form is correct, it furnishes a good instance of the caprice of the language; compare *ᾠοιδίαουσα*, *ναιετάωσα*, *ἀντιόωσα*.

6. Yet another variation is seen in *χρεώμενος* (Il. xxiii. 834) for *χρᾶόμενος*, *χρᾷόμενος*; for here the *ᾱ* is weakened to *ε* and forced by synizesis into the following syllable.

7. Peculiar is the form *ἄλώω* (Od. v. 377), imperative of *ἁλάσμαι*, for which Meyer has unsuccessfully tried to account. It arose, I conceive, in this way: from *ἁλάεο* came, by a double regressive assimilation, *ἄλώοο*; this would have contracted into *ἄλώου* but for the necessary shifting of quantity, which gave *ἄλώωο*, and then, by contraction, *ἄλώω*.

*Doric forms which have this ending yet retain the accent of those with *ειν*; *φυλάττεν*.

8. If the Aristarchean form *μενοινήσει* (3rd sing. subj.), Il. xv. 82, is right, we must acknowledge an assimilation the reverse of the usual one: we should expect *μενοινάσαι*; compare *έάας*, Od. xii. 137. This seems to be on a par with the Doric contraction of *αι* to *η*, some traces of which are seen in Epic, *φοιτήτην* for example.

9. Verbs in *óω* show some forms identical with those we have been discussing, and to be explained on precisely the same principles. Examples are: *ιδρώοντες*, *ὕπνώνοντες*, *ἀρόωσι*, *δηϊόωντο*, *δηϊόωεν*.

10. Similar forms are found in other Epic words of various sorts. *Νηπιάας* (Od. i. 297) is accus. pl. to *νηπιέη* (Il. ix. 491) and stands for *νηπιέας*. Usually it is wrongly explained as distracted from *νηπιᾶς*. Just so we may read that *φώς* is a resolved form of *φῶς*, but in reality it is uncontracted; *φαFος* is the original; thence *φᾶος* (shortened to *φᾶος*, but plur. *φάεα* retains *ā*), *φῶος*, *φῶος*. *Δεδάασθαι* for *δεδάεσθαι*, *φαάντατος* for *φαέντατος* (*φαεινός*), *γοάσσκον*, *ναιετάσσκον* for *γοάεσκον*, *ναιετέεσκον*, are cases in point. Instructive is *φᾶανθεν*, commonly explained as a lengthened form of *φάνθεν* (*ἐφάνθησαν*): it really belongs to *φαεινω*, which is, Buttmann to the contrary, a different verb from *φαίνω*. See Curtius' Etym., p. 278, on the root group *φα*, *φαF*, *φαν*. *Φαεινω* stands for *φαF-εν-ῖω*, *φᾶανθεν* for *φάFεν-θεν*. Noteworthy is the verb *κραίνω* with the aorist forms *κρήνον*, *κρήναι*, etc. (Od. xix. 567; xx. 115; v. 170) and the exactly corresponding *κραιαίνω*, *κρήηνον*, *κρηῆναι* (Il. v. 508; i. 41; ix. 101). Add aor. pass. *ἐκράνθη* (Pindar) and *ἐκράανθη* (Theocr.), verbals *ἄκραντος* (Aesch.) and *ἀκράαντος* (Il. ii. 138). With such a correspondence of forms it is not surprising that an "Epic duplication of the vowel" should have been recognized. Yet even here we shall be prepared to find that we have to deal with two verbs. Compare Curtius' Etym., p. 147, where for *κραιαίνω* a nominal stem *κρα-ῖαν* is assumed. *Κραιαίνω* stands for *κραιαν-ῖω*: the aor. *κραῖναι* became first *κρᾶῖναι*, then by assimilation *κρηῖναι*; the aor. passive *ἐκραιάνθη* became simply *ἐκρᾶάνθη*. *Κραίνω*, on the other hand, has the short stem *κραν*.

In conclusion I will simply say that I cannot agree with

Curtius and other recent authors of Greek grammars in thinking the true theory of these forms too difficult to find a place in school-books, and preferring to retain for practical purposes the old view. To attempt a complete elucidation of the history of these forms would, indeed, be as ill-advised as in treating of declension or of any other matter, but I can see no reason why we should not tell the truth as far as we go, rather than an error which must afterwards be unlearned. The main facts might be formulated for use in the class-room somewhat as follows: "The verbs in *áω*, when uncontracted, commonly show an assimilation of the two concurrent vowels, so as to give for *αε* or *αη* a double *a*-sound, and for *αο* or *αω* a double *o*-sound. This assimilation is usually accompanied by a lengthening of one or both of the vowels." In this form I have repeatedly given the explanation to classes and have found no difficulty in making it understood.

ADDENDUM.

The dissertation of Bernhard Mangold "*de diectasi Homerica, imprimis verborum in áω,*" printed in Curtius' *Studien*, VI. 1, reaches me just as the foregoing pages go to the printer. The author has discussed these forms at greater length and much more in detail than I have attempted to do. As his paper and mine have arisen quite independently of one another, it may be worth while to note the chief points of agreement and disagreement.

He coincides with me in his view of assimilation of the vowels; also in explaining the lengthening of the first vowel as due to the spirant in all cases. With respect to the lengthening of the second vowel, he thinks with me, and for similar reasons, that Curtius' argument against Meyer is invalid: he also holds with me that Meyer's presentation of the subject was unsatisfactory and inconclusive. But here we separate. For he rejects Curtius' theory of an interchange of quantity between the first and second vowels, and denies any effect of

the spirant whatever on the second vowel. He urges in support of this: 1st, that the examples of transfer of quantity all show a change of *áo*, *ηο*, into *εω*, or *ηα* into *εᾱ*, whereas no certain example of the passing of *ᾱᾱ*, *ωο*, into *ᾱᾱ*, *οω*, or of interchange between two vowels *alike in color*, can be found; 2nd, that the Homeric forms show that the stem-vowel *α* was *shortened* before assimilation took place; 3rd, that only those forms are found assimilated in which the second vowel was already long by nature or position. With regard to the first objection, I believe that *Κόωϋ* = *κῶωϋ* and others furnish just the examples that M. misses, though he has another way of disposing of them. At any rate, he shows no reason why the interchange might not take place between like vowels. Moreover, we might suppose that the interchange of quantity preceded the assimilation, so that it would not be between like vowels, after all. M. himself allows this in case of *φῶωϋ*, which he derives thus: *φᾱωϋ*, *φᾶωϋ*, *φῶωϋ*; and just the same method is applicable to the verbal forms. Even M. does not lay much weight on this objection, and says that it alone would not prevent him from adopting Curtius' theory. To pass to his second objection, he is here much in error. He finds that of those verbs in *áo* which do not admit assimilation all but three (*ἀναμαιμάω*, *πεινᾶω*, *διψᾶω*) have shortened the *α*, and hence he concludes that verbs which do admit assimilation must have shortened the *α* first. But this by no means follows, and *ἡβῶντα*, etc., prove that assimilation did sometimes take place before the stem-vowel was shortened. He goes on: "nam id profecto animum inducere non possumus, linguam, postquam ex fastidio quodam vocalium concurrentium eas inter se assimularit, juxta has formas etiam integras servasse earumque *ā* longam posteriore tempore corripuisse." But the language did do just this, witness *ἡβῶντα* and *πεινᾶντα*.* However, we may, as suggested above, explain *ὀρώντα* without having recourse to *ὀρώντα*; namely, from *ὀρᾶντα*. M. observes this, but says: "sed tum quomodo formae *ἡβῶντα*, *μνῶντα* ortae sint, omnino non intellegitur." On the contrary, it is his theory which

* There may have been some special reason for the non-assimilation of *ā* in *πεινᾶω*, *διψᾶω*: these verbs were peculiar in their Attic contraction.

renders these forms inexplicable. They may be readily derived from *ἡβᾶοντα*, etc.; the quantity could not interchange, simply because it would exclude the word from the verse. There is not the smallest difficulty in accounting for all forms on the theory of transfer of quantity. In fact, we may have our choice between two orders of development; either:

Original { *πεινᾶοντα* } reject { *πεινᾶοντα* . . . cannot shorten *α*, *πεινᾶοντα*.
 ναιετάοντα } *assim.* { *ναιετάοντα* . . . shortens *α*, *ναιετάοντα*.
 ἡβᾶοντα } admit { *ἡβᾶοντα* . . . cannot transf. *qu.*, *ἡβᾶοντα*.
 ὀρώοντα } *assim.* { *ὀρώοντα* . . . transfers quantity, *ὀρώοντα*.

or:

Original { *πεινᾶοντα* } cannot shorten { *πεινᾶοντα* . . . rejects *assim.* *πεινᾶοντα*.
 ἡβᾶοντα } nor transfer, { *ἡβᾶοντα* . . . admits " *ἡβᾶοντα*.
 ναιετάοντα } shortens, *ναιετάοντα* . . . rejects " *ναιετάοντα*.
 ὀρώοντα } transfers, *ὀρώοντα* . . . admits " *ὀρώοντα*.

Although in the preceding pages I have with Curtius assumed the former of these theories, I am now inclined, for reasons I will explain below, to adopt the latter. The third objection we have already sufficiently answered, page 12.

Having thus, for very insufficient reasons, as I conceive, rejected the notion of transferred length, Mangold explains the quantity of the second vowel differently in different forms.

1. In the infin. (*ὀράαν*) he denies altogether the length of the second *α*, on ground that it stands everywhere before two consonants or in a principal caesura.

2. With respect to the forms with *ωνντ*- and *οω*- he takes, after all, substantially Meyer's ground, claiming that they stand by a blunder for *οονντ*- and *οοι*-; he recognizes, however, as we have done, that this cannot be a mere clerical error of the transcribers, but thinks it due to a vicious pronunciation of the rhapsodists themselves.

3. As to the 2d and 3d pers., like *ὀράας*, *ὀράα*, he entertains the singular view that the organic lengthening of the second vowel, which belongs properly to 1st pers. only (Sanscr. *-ajāmi*, *-ajāsi*, *-ajāti*), was extended in Greek to the 2d and 3rd pers. (as, indeed, was the case in *τῆθημι*, *ἴστημι*), and that we have to start from *ὀρα-ῖη-σι*, *ὀρα-ῖη-τι*, instead of *ὀρα-ῖε-σι*, *ὀρα-ῖε-τι*, as commonly assumed. Of course he must suppose that this *η* when once introduced did not maintain itself, but made great haste to shorten itself again to give us *φιλέεις*, *στιχάει*, etc.

The forced nature of this explanation does not escape its author, who admits that he proposes it with hesitation.

4. The forms in *οωσι*, *οωσα*, M. follows Dietrich in deriving from *αουσι*, *αουσα*, by a double assimilation, first progressive, then regressive; *ὀπάουσι*, *ὀπάωσι* (since *ω* is nearer to *α* than *ου* is), *ὀπόωσι*. But the first of these assimilations I cannot find probable, and submit that my series *ὀπάουσι*, *ὀπόωνσι*, *ὀπόωσι*, sustained by the analogy of subj. mood, is simpler. M. says (p. 152, note) that *ναιεῖάουσα* proves that *ουσι* became *ουσι* before *α* was assimilated. That may be, though *ναιεῖάω*, being one of those verbs which for some unknown reason admits neither assimilation or lengthening, can prove nothing about those which do. Yet there is no difficulty in supposing that transfer of quantity took place, where it did at all, before *νσι* dropped its *ν*. Only it will be perhaps as well, since the assimilation (preparatory to contraction) would belong naturally to a later period, to assume that transfer preceded assimilation in point of time, adopting the second of the tables exhibited above. On this plan we might suppose:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{ναιεῖάουσι shortens, ναιεῖᾰουσι} \\ \text{ὀπάουσι transfers, ὀπᾰώνσι} \end{array} \right\} \nu \text{ disapp. } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ναιεῖάουσι.} \\ \text{ὀπάωσι, assim. ὀπόωσι.} \end{array} \right.$$

On the whole, therefore, I cannot say that my views have been much modified by the perusal of Mangold's paper. Yet it is an able one, showing great diligence, and, except in the points spoken of, eminently satisfactory.